

January 24, 2006

5310 Las Lomas Street

Long Beach, CA 90815

Angela Reynolds

Environmental Officer

City of Long Beach

Planning and Building Department

333 West Ocean Avenue

Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

Please include the enclosed questions and comments in
the Long Beach Airport Environmental Impact Report.

Thank you.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Jeff Huso', with a stylized, cursive script.

Jeff Huso

The EIR begins by assuming we are going to have the maximum number of flights allowable under the noise ordinance. Airport Manager Chris Kunze was given instructions by the city council to market slots for flights with the objective of maximizing the number of flights under the noise ordinance. Why is the city council seeking to maximize the number of flights when affected residents have shown up in numbers on more than one occasion to let it be known they are unhappy with noise from present flights?

The report goes on to propose that since we will have maximum flights by council instruction we should then build larger facilities and designate 40% more aircraft parking spaces to accomodate the maximum number of flights (and noise). It posits that Alternative A which increases the spaces by 4 to 14 must be "environmentally" superior to Alternative C which leaves the spaces at 10. The authors theorize that more spaces on the ground might translate into jets turning their engines off sooner. They do not mention that it is the noise from engines overhead which projects further and is more obnoxious to residents more often.

And the report does not adequately consider the likely increased number of flights accompanying adverse developments

to our noise ordinance anytime going forward. In the case that our ordinance is successfully challenged our current facilities and number of spaces could be a second line of defense. Assistant City Attorney Mike Mais said that the reverse of this is not true; that keeping the facilities and aircraft parking spaces as is will not jeopardize the noise ordinance. Why doesn't the EIR suggest that only Alternative 3 can not encourage more flights and noise under all circumstances?

Why does the report direct our attention to thresholds of cardio-vascular damage from noise? Are we mere animals in a lab experiment? Is this not a quality of life issue? With large airports twenty miles in either direction which offer a full range of flights to anywhere in the world why are we compromising the liveability of Long Beach for resident voters? Is it for the personal financial interests of relatively few? Is it for the convenience of others too lazy and inconsiderate to get a ride to LAX or John Wayne when the flight they want isn't flying overhead here in our local Los Angeles metropolitan suburb? Don't be so provincial to think Southland cities haven't blended together. If businesses need to be next to a large airport why didn't they locate near John Wayne or LAX? And ditto for residents who want to be very close to one.

Environmental Impact Report Appendix F-15 states:

"Annoyance and sleep/interference have been acknowledged... other observed psychophysiological effects, immunological indicators, and gastrointestinal disturbances are too inconsistent for conclusions to be drawn about the influence of noise pollution," (Quoting a World Health Organization Report). "In other words," the EIR writers conclude for us, "the World Health Organization believes that health effects do not occur at noise levels less than 65 CNEL." Isn't it a violation of Logic 101 to say from inconclusiveness a conclusion can be drawn?

With residents complaining about noise from flights in the air now, with 10 parking spaces, why is the city council considering Alternative A adding 40% more spaces? The EIR writers say all three alternatives will result in the same "optimal" (note the bias), meaning maximum under the noise ordinance, number of flights. However they provide no substantive evidence that Alternative A, with 14 spaces, would not, under future circumstances, encourage and facilitate more flights than Alternative C which maintains our current 10 parking spaces. The writers assume that our noise ordinance will never be successfully challenged in order to conclude that 40% larger Alternative A will never attract more flights.

Isn't a faulty assumption used to try to erase the obvious advantage of Alternative C?

The writers of the EIR fail to mention, under "1.33 Regulatory Setting," that an older, predecessor noise ordinance was lost due, apparently, to neglect or malfeasance on the part of the then sitting city council here in Long Beach. That ordinance allowed far fewer than the current 41 minimum flights. It was successfully challenged by the airlines pursuant to FAA regulation owing to a technicality violated; the airlines were not properly notified of the ordinance. When the council became aware of the proper corrective action to take in order to notify the airlines legally, the council never took the action until the time to do so had expired. The council was then in a position, by design or neglect, of having to compromise with the airlines resulting in our present much larger number of flights allowed despite the will of the residents against this. Yet the writers of the EIR don't mention this and say that 14 parking spaces under Alternative A are no more likely than 10 aircraft parking spaces under Alternative C to result in additional flights and noise overhead under a future sitting city council. Such council openly or secretly might favor an airline lobbyist or other political constituent over affected residents.

"There are sensitive land uses within the 65 CNEL contour under both existing and 'Optimal Flights scenario," say the writers. "Within 24 months of the certification of the EIR the Airport Manager shall develop a land use compatibility program addressing existing and future aviation noise levels. The program shall be voluntary." But then they go on to say the residents and schools will be required to give the City a "noise easement" over their properties in exchange for "sound insulation treatment." Question: Was the idea that schools and residents should have to give the City a "noise easement" over their properties thought up as a "helpful suggestion" by the EIR writers drawing upon their experience helping get airport expansions approved?

Isn't the EIR, as it sits, just another legal requirement to protect the City from lawsuits by disaffected resident voters? After all, how many Kangaroo Rats did anyone expect to find at the airport? And "environmental" ~~has such an interesting~~ to it when, in fact, the report is not even primarily concerned with the quality of life of real people and their real environmental well-being.

I recommend that the city council rescind its policy of maximizing the number of flights at the airport within the noise ordinance. Many residents have, over time, shown up at meetings to let it be known that if the Council respects

them and their communities it will work to protect the noise ordinance but stop doing things to get more planes and noise in the air.

Keep the facilities and the number of aircraft parking spaces the same. This is a necessary bricks and mortar second line of defense to the noise ordinance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Jeff Huso". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "J" and a cursive "Huso".

Jeff Huso

5310 Las Lomas Street

Long Beach, CA 90815